

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9 and 11-13 are all the claims pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 6 and 9 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 2, 7 and 10, respectively. Independent claim 12 is amended similarly. Claims 2, 7 and 10 are cancelled. No new matter is presented.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carcerano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,205, hereinafter “Carcerano”) in view of admitted prior art. Further, Claims 2, 7, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Carcerano in view of admitted prior art, further in view of Matseuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,016, hereinafter “Matseuda”). These grounds of rejection are traversed.

Independent claim 1 defines a device management network system including a management server, one or more devices to be managed, and one or more client devices. For instance, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that the management server sends information containing names of image files associated with abnormalities, as specified by the specifying part, to the client device that sent the device-details screen request. Further, the specifying part of the management server is disclosed as specifying abnormalities of a network device based on status information obtained from the network device.

As noted above, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which is canceled by the present Amendment. Thus, claim 1 requires “wherein said information sending

part of said management server sends information containing names of image files associating with the abnormalities specified by said specifying part.” With respect to the Examiner’s discussion of the rejection of claim 2, the Examiner concedes that Carcerano and admitted prior art does not disclose the features recited in claim 2 and relies on Matsueda to cure this deficiency.

In particular, the Examiner refers to column 4, lines 3-25 and column 5, lines 1-34 of Matsueda. However, the “image data” of Matsueda merely relates to print data (*see* Matsueda at col. 3, lines 36-45). Moreover, the image data of Matsueda is not “associated” with abnormalities, as recited by claim 1. Rather, in Matsueda, if an error in the image data memory 204 of facsimile apparatus 101 is detected, the image data, i.e., print data, is transferred to server machine 103 (Matsueda at col. 2, lines 45-48; col. 4, line 31 to col. 5, line 5). The image data can then later be transferred back to the image data memory 204 of the facsimile apparatus 101 for printing (col. 6, lines 10-33). The transfer of the image data, i.e., print data, back and forth to the server machine 103 is performed to allow the continual flow of data, even in the event of a printer error or insufficiency of image memory space (Abstract; col. 1, lines 37-59).

Clearly, the detection of an error in Matsueda fails to provide any teaching or suggestion for sending, to a client device that sent the device details request, information containing names of image files associated with abnormalities of a network device, as defined by claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that Matsueda fails to cure the deficient teachings of Carcerano and the APA. Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the motivation to combine of Carcerano in view of APA, further in view of Matsueda is proper, Applicant respectfully

submits that the combination fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1 *at least* for the reasons discussed above, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In addition, Applicant submits that the above arguments are equally applicable to independent claims 6, 9 and 12, which are similarly amended to recite that the information sending part of said management server sends information containing names of image files associating with the abnormalities specified by said specifying part. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 9 and 12 is requested.

Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 3-5, 8, 11, and 13 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependency from independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 12. Accordingly, allowance of all pending claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9 and 11-13 is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 109/541,593

Attorney Docket No.: Q58612

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

for  (Reg. No. 50,245)
Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

Date: May 17, 2005